



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/820,630

04/07/2004

Ira Goldstein

200208339-1

8828

22879

7590

04/30/2009

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY  
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION  
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

PACHOL, NICHOLAS C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/30/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM  
ipa.mail@hp.com  
jessica.l.fusek@hp.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/820,630	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GOLDSTEIN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Nicholas C. Pachol	<b>Art Unit</b> 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 12-19, 21, 23, 24, 52 and 72-74 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 12-19, 21, 23, 24, 52 and 72-74 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 03/02/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In regards to applicant's argument that "Euchner does not teach the digital pattern being provided by a first printer and the content being provided by a second printer," the examiner respectfully disagrees. The claim limitation of concern is summarized to be that the content is printed on a sheet with a second printer. Wherein, the sheet contains a preprinted pattern that is printed by a first printer. Euchner does in fact teach this limitation. In Column 5, lines 11-16, Euchner teaches that the pattern can be pre-printed with the digital pattern. The applicant argues that the preprinting is done by the same printer as the printer that prints the content. Therefore, there is no first and second printer.. The examiner disagrees. According to Euchner in Column 5, lines 22-25, each user has there own printer. The printer can print a copy of the document for each user. Euchner specifically states that "The individual copy is then printed locally." This clearly shows that there are multiple printers, wherein each user has their own printer. Since the paper can be preprinted with the digital pattern, then printer 110, could preprint the sheet. Then the user would then print the content with their respective printer. This clearly shows two printers being used. Another way of looking at it is that printer one is capable of printing both the pattern and the content. Printer two can print both the pattern and the content. Since both printers can print both the pattern and the content, then one of the printers could print the pattern and the other could print the content or both printers could print both the pattern and the content.

Art Unit: 2625

Therefore Euchner does teach " digital pattern being provided by a first printer and the content being provided by a second printer." To further clarify, the examiner used Coffy to demonstrate that the paper can be pre-printed by another printer and used on a second printer. This is described in Column 5, lines 1-10 of Coffy. This then makes the printer in Euchner demonstrate the effects of a second printer by having the printer in Coffy that pre-prints the pattern being the first printer. Therefore, Euchner in view of Coffy does all of the limitations as claimed in claim 1.

### ***Claim Objections***

2. According to applicant's remarks, on Page 7, first line, claim 53 is indicated as pending and 52 is not pending. Throughout the rest of the arguments and according to the claims 52 is pending and 53 is not. Therefore, the examiner is assuming that this was a typo and 52 should be pending and claim 53 is cancelled, as made clear by the filed claims.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-9, 12-19, 21, and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Euchner (US 7,111,230) in view of Coffy (US 6,915,281).

Regarding Claim 1, Euchner teaches a method of associating in computer memory (Column 5, lines 4-16)

(i) a digital electronic version of printed human-discernible content of a printed document comprising a sheet having a machine-readable pattern adapted to enable the position of a digital pattern reading device to be determined (Column 3, lines 47-59) and said human-discernible content with

(ii) the identity of a sheet upon which the content is printed (Column 4, lines 39-45), the method comprising:

printing the content onto a sheet using a second printer, said sheet comprising a pre-patterned sheet that has been pre-printed by a printer with said pattern (Column 5, lines 11-16, and line 22-25);

transferring a machine-readable identity code between said second printer and said sheet at around the time of printing said content (Column 4, lines 41-45); and

storing a correlation between said identity code and said digital electronic version in computer memory (Column 5, lines 4-16).

Euchner does not teach said sheet comprising a pre-patterned sheet that has been pre-printed by a first printer with said pattern.

Coffy does teach said sheet comprising a pre-patterned sheet that has been pre-printed by a first printer with said pattern (Column 5, lines 1-10, wherein since Euchner is says in Column 5, lines 11-16 and lines 22-25, that the paper can be pre-printed it can therefore be pre-printed with the pattern by a different printer as Coffy teaches.

Art Unit: 2625

This then makes the printer in Euchner demonstrate the effects of a second printer by having the printer in Coffy that pre-prints the pattern being the first printer).

Euchner and Coffy are combinable because they both teach editing a hardcopy of a document though the means of an electronic pen.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Euchner with the teachings of Coffy for the purpose of having the best printer available to print the pattern on the paper, to create the best image of the pattern on the paper (Coffy: Column 6, lines 5-10).

Regarding Claim 2, Euchner further teaches wherein said identity code is read from said sheet by said second printer (Column 9, lines 19-25).

Regarding Claim 3, Euchner further teaches wherein said identity code is printed on said sheet by said second printer (Column 4, lines 42-45).

Regarding Claim 4, Euchner further teaches wherein a plurality of sheets have the same pre-printed pattern and are given individual identities by using said second printer to apply different machine-readable identity codes to each of them at around the time of printing each sheet (Column 8, lines 4-10).

Euchner does not teach wherein a plurality of sheets have the same pre-printed pattern as provided by the first printer.

Art Unit: 2625

Coffy does teach wherein a plurality of sheets have the same pre-printed pattern as provided by the first printer (Column 5, lines 1-10).

Euchner and Coffy are combinable because they both teach editing a hardcopy of a document though the means of an electronic pen.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Euchner with the teachings of Coffy for the purpose of having the best printer available to print the pattern on the paper, to create the best image of the pattern on the paper (Coffy: Column 6, lines 5-10).

Regarding Claim 5, Euchner further teaches wherein said machine-readable identity code comprises at least one code from the group:

- (i) a pattern of dots;
- (ii) a pattern of lines;
- (iii) a pattern of printed objects whose positions and/or shapes code for an identity;
- (iv) a position determining pattern;
- (v) a bar code (Column 2, lines 34-36).

Regarding Claim 6, Euchner further teaches wherein the second printer which prints said content onto said pre-patterned sheet has a pattern reading device, and wherein said second printer acquires data from said pre-printed pattern on the said

Art Unit: 2625

sheet that is to be printed with content, in order to enable the identity of pattern on said sheet to be established, thereby enabling said association to be made in computer memory (Column 4, lines 42-45);

said second printer uses data from a digital electronic version of content to print said content onto said pre-patterned sheet (Column 4, lines 40-41); and

wherein said association is made in computer memory between said digital electronic version of said content and said identity of pattern (Column 4, lines 38-45).

Regarding Claim 7, Euchner further teaches wherein said pre-printed pattern is associated in computer memory with specific digital electronic content and wherein upon recognition of said pattern using data acquired by said pattern reading device of said second printer (Column 4, lines 42-45), said specific digital electronic content is caused to be printed onto said pre-patterned sheet as human-discernible content (Column 4, lines 38-45).

Regarding Claim 8, Euchner further teaches wherein different users have different pattern associated with them and wherein upon recognition of their pattern from data from said second printer's pattern reading device said content printer is caused to print user-specific content onto said sheet (Column 5, lines 47-55).



Regarding Claim 9, Euchner further teaches wherein said human-discernible content comprises document-type content and user-specific content, wherein one from the group:

- (i) document-specific content; and
- (ii) user-specific content

is selected by a user, and the other from said group is obtained from a predetermined correlation between said identity code that has been read by said printer and a digital electronic version said content (Column 4, lines 52-62).

Regarding Claim 12, Euchner teaches a method of associating in computer memory a digital electronic version of printed human discernible content of a printed document with an identity code adapted to identify said document (Column 5, lines 26-40), the method comprising:

using a plurality of pages of pre-patterned digital paper that have been pre-printed by a printer with a position-determining pattern, said pattern being adapted to enable a digital pen to acquire information from said pattern to enable the position of said pen on said pattern to be determined (Column 7, lines 56-61);

printing said content on said digital paper using a second printer (Column 7, lines 56-61);

using said content printer to be instrumental in conveying an identity code to or from the paper (Column 4, lines 46-51);

and associating in computer memory, using said code transferred, at the time of printing said content onto said pre-patterned paper, a digital electronic version of said content with the identity code for the particular sheet of digital paper upon which said content is printed (Column 4, lines 38-45).

Euchner does not teach using a plurality of pages of pre-patterned digital paper that have been pre-printed by a first printer with a position-determining pattern.

Coffy does teach using a plurality of pages of pre-patterned digital paper that have been pre-printed by a first printer with a position-determining pattern (Column 5, lines 1-10, wherein since Euchner is says in Column 5, lines 14-16, that the paper can be pre-printed it can therefore be pre-printed with the pattern by a different printer as Coffy teaches. This then makes the printer in Euchner demonstrate the effects of a second printer by having the printer in Coffy that pre-prints the pattern being the first printer).

Euchner and Coffy are combinable because they both teach editing a hardcopy of a document though the means of an electronic pen.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Euchner with the teachings of Coffy for the purpose of having the best printer available to print the pattern on the paper, to create the best image of the pattern on the paper (Coffy: Column 6, lines 5-10).

Regarding Claim 13, Euchner further teaches wherein an identity code adapted to distinguish a specific sheet of pre-pattern digital paper is printed onto said specific sheet as part of an operation of printing said content onto said specific sheet, said identity code being readable by a digital pen and being capable of being used to distinguish data acquired by a digital pen from said specific sheet from data acquired by said pen from other sheets of pre- patterned paper having the same position-determining pattern on them as does said specific sheet (Column 8, lines 4-10).

Regarding Claim 14, Euchner further teaches wherein an identity code adapted to distinguish a specific sheet of pre-patterned digital pattern is printed on said specific sheet in an operation prior to printing said content onto said specific sheet, and wherein a second printer which prints said content onto said pre-patterned paper has an identity code reading device, said second printer being capable of acquiring data from said identity code, said identity code being capable of being used to distinguish data acquired by a digital pen from said specific sheet from data acquired by said pen from other sheets of pre-patterned paper having the same position-determining pattern on them as does said specific sheet, to enable said association to be made between said digital electronic version of said content and said identity code (Column 8, lines 4-10).

Regarding Claim 15, Euchner further teaches wherein a plurality of different identity codes are printed on a respective plurality of pre-patterned sheets each having the same pre-printed position-determining pattern, said identity codes enabling a digital

Art Unit: 2625

pen to acquire sheet identity data to enable data acquired from each sheet to be distinguished from data acquired from other sheets (Column 8, lines 4-10).

Regarding Claim 16, Euchner further teaches wherein said identity code is associated in computer memory with specific digital electronic content and wherein upon recognition of said identity code using data acquired by said identity code reading device of said second printer (Column 4, lines 42-45), said specific digital electronic content is caused to be printed onto said pre-patterned sheet as human discernible content (Column 4, lines 38-45).

Regarding Claim 17, Euchner further teaches wherein different users have different identity codes associated with them and wherein upon recognition of their identity code from data from said second printer's identity code reading device said second printer is caused to print user-specific content onto said sheet (Column 5, lines 46-55).

Regarding Claim 18, Euchner further teaches wherein said identity code is printed in an area of said pre-patterned paper which is from the group:

- (i) free of pattern;
- (ii) substantially free of pattern (Column 4, lines 12-20).

Art Unit: 2625

Regarding Claim 19, Euchner further teaches wherein an area of said sheets from the group:

- (i) all of a surface of each of the sheets;
  - (ii) substantially all of a surface of each of the sheets;
  - (iii) at least half of the surface area of each of the sheets;
  - (iv) at least a tenth of the surface area of each of the sheets;
- are pre-printed with pattern (Column 3, lines 60-65).

Regarding Claim 21, Euchner does not teach wherein said second printer is

- (i) not capable of printing said pattern satisfactorily; or
- (ii) configured not to be capable of printing said pattern satisfactorily.

Coffy does teach wherein said second printer is

- (i) not capable of printing said pattern satisfactorily; or
- (ii) configured not to be capable of printing said pattern satisfactorily.

Coffy does teach wherein said second printer is

- (i) not capable of printing said pattern satisfactorily; or
- (ii) configured not to be capable of printing said pattern satisfactorily.

Coffy does teach wherein said second printer is

- (i) not capable of printing said pattern satisfactorily; or
- (ii) configured not to be capable of printing said pattern satisfactorily (Column 5, lines 5-10).

Art Unit: 2625

Euchner and Coffy are combinable because they both teach editing a hardcopy of a document though the means of an electronic pen.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Euchner with the teachings of Coffy for the purpose of having the best printer available to print the pattern on the paper, to create the best image of the pattern on the paper (Coffy: Column 6, lines 5-10).

Regarding Claim 52, Euchner teaches a method of combining pen strokes made with a digital pen upon a digital sheet having pen position-determining pattern printed upon it and human-discernible content printed upon it (Column 2, lines 15-23) comprising:

printing said sheet with said pattern in a pre-patterning operation with a printer to create a pre-patterned sheet (Column 5, lines 11-16 and line 22-25);

subsequently printing said content onto said pre-patterned sheet using a second printer to create a content-printed digital sheet (Column 4, lines 38-45 and Column 5, lines 11-16 and line 22-25);

transferring an identity code between said second printer and said sheet to enable the identity of said sheet to be established in a subsequent pen-on-sheet writing operation, the transfer of said identity code occurring in the same time frame as printing said content onto said sheet (Column 4, lines 41-45);

Art Unit: 2625

associating in computer memory a link between said identity code and an electronic version of said content that was printed on said sheet (Column 5, lines 4-16);

using a digital pen to make pen strokes on said content-printed sheet (Column 4, lines 30-37);

conveying pen-acquired pen-position data, relating to the position of said pen in said pattern to a processor (Column 5, lines 35-40, wherein the server has a processor to process the information);

using the digital pen to acquire said identity code from said content- printed sheet (Column 8, lines 4-10);

the processor using the pen-acquired identity code, the pen acquired pen-position data, and the link between said identity code and said electronic version of said content to combine said pen strokes with said content (Column 5, lines 35-40, wherein the server has a processor to process the information).

Euchner does not teach printing said sheet with said pattern in a pre-patterning operation with a first printer.

Coffy does teach printing said sheet with said pattern in a pre-patterning operation with a first printer (Column 5, lines 1-10, wherein since Euchner is says in Column 5, lines 11-16 and line 22-25, that the paper can be pre-printed it can therefore be pre-printed with the pattern by a different printer as Coffy teaches. This then makes the printer in Euchner demonstrate the effects of a second printer by having the printer in Coffy that pre-prints the pattern being the first printer).

Euchner and Coffy are combinable because they both teach editing a hardcopy of a document though the means of an electronic pen.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Euchner with the teachings of Coffy for the purpose of having the best printer available to print the pattern on the paper, to create the best image of the pattern on the paper (Coffy: Column 6, lines 5-10).

5. Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over obviousness by Euchner (US 7,111,230) in view of Coffy (US 6,915,281).

Regarding Claim 23, Euchner in view of Coffy does not teach wherein said first printer has substantially better print resolution than does said second printer.

Official notice is taken that if the printed pattern can be printed by another printer, or pre-printed, then the printer that is doing the printing of the pattern would have better resolution than the second printer.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a printer to print the pattern out on a printer that has better resolution because the printer that has better resolution would be more preferable to print out the pattern.



Regarding Claim 24, Euchner further teaches wherein pre-printed digital paper is taken from said first printer and put into a plurality of second printers (Column 5, lines 14-25) .

6. Claims 72-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Euchner (US 7,111,230) in view of Coffy (US 6,915,281) further in view of Korst (US 7,050,181).

Regarding Claim 72, Euchner in view of Coffy does not teach wherein the second printer is an existing legacy printer.

Korst does teach wherein the second printer is an existing legacy printer (Column 2, lines 11-33, wherein Korst states to modify an existing legacy printer to accept commands as if it was a regular printer. Therefore since Korst states that a legacy printer can function as a regular printer, Euchner's printer can be modified to be a legacy printer.).

Euchner in view of Coffy and Korst are combinable because they both teaching printing documents.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Euchner in view of Coffy with Korst for the purpose of having a legacy printer function as a current printer (Column 2, lines 11-15).

Art Unit: 2625

Regarding Claim 73, Euchner in view of Coffy does not teach wherein the second printer is an existing legacy printer.

Korst does teach wherein the second printer is an existing legacy printer (Column 2, lines 11-33, wherein Korst states to modify an existing legacy printer to accept commands as if it was a regular printer. Therefore since Korst states that a legacy printer can function as a regular printer, Euchner's printer can be modified to be a legacy printer.).

Euchner in view of Coffy and Korst are combinable because they both teaching printing documents.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Euchner in view of Coffy with Korst for the purpose of having a legacy printer function as a current printer (Column 2, lines 11-15).

Regarding Claim 74, Euchner in view of Coffy does not teach wherein the second printer is an existing legacy printer.

Korst does teach wherein the second printer is an existing legacy printer (Column 2, lines 11-33, wherein Korst states to modify an existing legacy printer to accept commands as if it was a regular printer. Therefore since Korst states that a legacy printer can function as a regular printer, Euchner's printer can be modified to be a legacy printer.).

Euchner in view of Coffy and Korst are combinable because they both teaching printing documents.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Euchner in view of Coffy with Korst for the purpose of having a legacy printer function as a current printer (Column 2, lines 11-15).

### ***Conclusion***

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas C. Pachol whose telephone number is 571-270-3433. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thr, 8:00 a.m.- 4:00 p.m. (EST), Fridays off.

Art Unit: 2625

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler L. Haskins can be reached on 571-272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

N.P.

04/24/09

/Twyler L. Haskins/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625